

Citation for published version:

Marshall, H 2009, 'Educating the European citizen in the global age: engaging with the post-national and identifying a research agenda', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 247-267.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270802642002>

DOI:

[10.1080/00220270802642002](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270802642002)

Publication date:

2009

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article published in Marshall, H., 2009, Educating the European citizen in the global age: engaging with the postnational and identifying a research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(2), 247-267, copyright Taylor & Francis, available online at:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00220270802642002>

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Educating the European citizen in the global age: critically engaging with postnational citizenship education in the UK and identifying a research agenda

HARRIET MARSHALL*

Abstract

Over the past decades there has been a rise in calls for UK schools to develop a more European and global orientation in their pedagogy and curriculum and to equip children and young people with postnational knowledge, skills and dispositions. This paper examines some of the key problems relating to postnational conceptions of citizenship education with a view to developing a research agenda which focuses on the contested nature of notions of postnational citizenship (with particular focus upon European and global citizenship) and the way these are understood as having competing claims in education. In examining these issues the paper provides an explanation for the confused governmental agendas and commitments in relation to European and/or global citizenship education, and ends by considering alternative theories of citizenship, curriculum and pedagogy that may provide a deeper understanding of the associated issues and tensions. The focus of the paper relates to the UK, in particular the cases of England, Scotland and Wales, but some of the debates will have a wider significance.

Keywords: citizenship education; global citizenship; European citizenship; cosmopolitanism; curriculum.

Introduction

Citizenship needs to be recast, set apart from the nation state, and newly theorised in terms of emerging transnational and perhaps global political structures, as well as in the public spheres of civil society. (Smith 2007: 33)

As citizenship becomes increasingly decoupled from the nation-state (Smith 2007), we encounter an ever-expanding plurality of citizenship-related constructs, terms, and ideals-- although these must always be situated in the contexts in which they emerge. Multiple, multi-levelled, flexible, shifting, manufactured and imagined citizenships accompany those geographically-specified concepts such as local, community, national, European, South-American and global citizenships, or those indicating levels of involvement such as maximal, minimal, active, thick, thin, participatory, and passive. These types of citizenships, in turn, can be situated among more traditional divisions between social, political, civil, republican, liberal, communitarian, and cosmopolitan citizenships. Notions of other 'new' citizenships can also be identified. For example: Urry (1998: 3-4) identifies ecological, cultural, minority, and mobility citizenships in academic discourse. The multiple citizenship discourse is not entirely unrelated to that of multiple identities, which features regularly in education policy, academic literature, and press. This paper recognises this multiplicity of citizenships and identities, relates this understanding to schools and the education of young people, and places this in a complex global arena. The aim of this paper is to examine some of the key problems relating to postnational conceptions of citizenship education with a view to developing a research agenda which focuses on the contested nature of notions of postnational citizenship and the way these are understood as having competing claims. In so doing, the paper also plays with at least two seemingly simple hypotheses: first, that European citizenship as an educational ideal and as a set of curricular realisations has been trumped by that of global citizenship education in the UK; and second that European and national citizenship education is problematic for teachers to work with in a multicultural and globally-situated setting

because they are based upon overt forms of exclusion. In other words, the ‘local’ and the ‘global’ are often more pedagogically manageable and accessible for schools.

This paper takes a broad view of curriculum in view of the fact that global and European citizenship education initiatives have an unofficial status in the UK. While there is an identifiable global and European dimension to the official Citizenship Curriculum in England (Qualification and Curriculum Authority 2007ⁱ), the majority of the curricular recommendations, resources and policies originate from the non-governmental organisation (NGO) levelⁱⁱ. In addition, calls for postnational citizenship education arise from a variety of places or sectors and for a number of reasons. Desires to equip children and young people with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that will make them more globally minded (because the world is becoming increasingly interdependent) combine with desires to promote social cohesion and tolerance at a local, national, and international level. Advocates also indicate that postnational citizenship education provides an appropriate space for the multiple and multi-levelled identities of young peopleⁱⁱⁱ. This paper begins by examining and mapping some of these drivers.

Calls for Postnational Citizenship Education

There are clearly identifiable calls for different forms of postnational citizenship education in formal schooling in the UK. The most explicit of these are global citizenship education or the global dimension in education--although the European dimension is far from invisible. Over the last three or four decades there have been a number of identifiable movements to incorporate a European and/or global dimension into primary and secondary school curricula. The 1970s were particularly significant for a number of reasons, including the fact that the UK joined the European Union (EU) in 1973 and that the World Studies movement (as well as other global education traditions) were firmly established in this decade (Hicks 2003 and Marshall 2005).

Keating (2007) has identified three key phases of European citizenship education initiatives originating from the EU and Council of Europe. The latest of these began around 1992 with the formal establishment of citizenship of EU when the Treaty of European Union was signed in Maastricht. The firm establishment of citizenship rights for individuals of all member states extended citizens' 'feelings' of belonging to 'legal ties' of belonging (Weiner 1998 as cited in Keating 2007: 164). It also entrenched the motto 'united in diversity' which slightly altered the 'united by common history and culture' discourse of the 1970s and 80s. This united in diversity approach became recognisable in two significant European citizenship education initiatives originating from the Council of Europe and EU: Secondary Education for Europe (1991-1996) and Education for Democratic Citizenship (1997-time of writing). The first of these initiatives, in particular, resulted in a number of teaching resources being produced and in the creation of regional European Resource Centres (ERCs) throughout the UK. These centres began to work with schools to promote a 'European dimension to values, citizenship, cultural heritage, and a general European awareness' (Keating 2007: 168).

These projects had some notable successes in that all member states supposedly include teaching about the EU in their curricula (this is particularly visible in a country like Finland). However, although initiatives feature in writing in citizenship education policy in England, they have arguably struggled to engage young people and struggled to become entrenched in schools. Many ERCs also failed to secure funding in order to continue their work with schools. This light touch approach has been exacerbated by the contentious nature of England's (and other parts of the UK) relationship with the EU. In other words, despite numerous Council of Europe and EU education for European citizenship recommendations (documented by Keating 2007), the underlying unresolved disputes about England's role and place in Europe makes the concept of European Citizenship extremely challenging for

teachers to deal with in the classroom beyond an economic and/or legal/rights-based approach (discussed later). Similar pedagogical challenges may be encountered by teachers now also trying to teach about 'Britishness'. For example, a recent report recommended that 'identity and diversity: living together in the UK' become a key part of the Citizenship Curriculum in schools (Department for Education and Skills 2007).

Guidance and recommendation for teaching about European citizenship education in the National Curriculum for England can be found most overtly in the Citizenship Curriculum. It has links to the three sets of key concepts underpinning the curriculum: democracy and justice; rights and responsibilities; and identities and diversity (living together in the UK) (Qualification and Curriculum Authority 2007: 28-9). Students attain higher grades (or 'attainment levels') for relating ideas of UK citizenship to that of European citizenship (2007: 36-7). In Scotland, the European dimension has played a prominent role in educational policy and discourse as illustrated below:

The education system in Scotland has become increasingly aware of Scotland's position within Europe and of the need to promote the European dimension in schools through formal and informal curriculum, including whole-school links and teacher exchanges... Key publications like Thinking European: Ideas for integrating a European dimension... and Further ideas for integrating a European dimension in the curriculum... provided substantial help to primary, secondary and special schools in how to integrate the European dimension into formal curriculum. (Scottish Executive 2001: 23).

Outside of the UK recent guidance on European citizenship education from the Council of Europe emphasised the need for 'active', committed and 'participative' forms of citizenship. These are aimed at 'securing the stability of the EU' to increase levels of political activity, to shore up the legitimacy of the European constitution, and to respond to the perceived rise in non-democratic forms of political activism (Milana 2008: 211).

Similar to the movement for European citizenship education, there is an identifiable and historically-rooted movement for global citizenship education in the UK. This movement, like its European counterpart, owes much to the role of non-governmental

organisations (NGOs) and individuals, and has evolved where open (national) governmental support has been only a relatively recent development. The movement for global citizenship education as mapped and defined by Hicks (2003) and Marshall (2005, 2007b), has suffered a similarly marginal status in educational policy, discourse, and practice over the past 35 years in the UK. By utilising the term ‘global education’ as an umbrella^{iv} for a variety of educational traditions that advocate education for greater justice, democracy, and human rights with (or from) a global perspective--such as development education, human rights education, education for sustainable development, peace and conflict resolution education, and so forth--it is possible to identify at least two stages in the movement’s history in the UK (Marshall 2005). The first emergent phase which relates to activities between NGOs (such as the Council for Education in World Citizenship and Development Education Centres) and teachers and schools, resulted in projects such as the World Studies Project. This phase spanned approximately the 1940s to the late 1980s. The movement became more defined as networks and partnerships formed across different traditions and levels of political radicalism in this first phase. However, it was not until the second (and ongoing) phase which began arguably in the early 1990s, that the movement managed to secure greater official support (both fiscal and ideological) particularly through partnerships with the governmental Department for International Development and its development awareness fund.

It is in this second phase that the term ‘global citizenship education’ has become common currency. This has had much to do with the impact and profile of Oxfam’s curriculum for global citizenship (Oxfam 1997, 2006), which can now be seen in schools’ policies as far away as Taiwan^v. Oxfam’s definition of global citizenship education states ‘education for global citizenship enables pupils to develop the knowledge, skills, and values needed for securing a just and sustainable world in which all may fulfil their potential’

(Oxfam 2006: 1). This definition also has the following pedagogical translation which reveals the strong affective and normative dimensions of the NGO postnational citizenship discourse,

Children and young people the opportunity to develop critical thinking about complex global issues in the safe space of the classroom...Far from promoting one set of answers, Education for Global Citizenship encourages children and young people to explore, develop and express their own values and opinions, whilst listening to and respecting other people's points of view. (Oxfam 2006: 2)

Global citizenship education appears overtly in both the Citizenship Curriculum and in at least two of the non-statutory but strongly recommended cross-curriculum dimensions in the National Curriculum for England, both of which emphasise its holistic and interdisciplinary nature. The cross-curricular dimensions, which include global dimension and sustainable development, identity and cultural diversity, technology and the media amongst four others, are defined and explained in the following way:

[they] provide important unifying areas of learning that help young people make sense of the world and give education relevance and authenticity. They reflect the major ideas and challenges that face individuals and society... They can provide a focus for work within and between subjects and across the curriculum as a whole, including the routines, events and ethos of the school. (Qualifications, Curriculum Authority website, <http://curriculum.qca.org.uk/key-stages-3-and-4/cross-curriculum-dimensions>, accessed May 15, 2008)

In addition to the formal requirements of the National Curriculum, a number of governmental documents, recommendations and strategies such as Putting the World into World Class Education (Department for Education and Skills 2004), Developing a Global Dimension in the School Curriculum (Department for Education and Skills 2005) and the Sustainable Schools Initiative (Department for Education and Skills 2006) are aimed at English schools and include unambiguous references to the idea of global citizenship. In Wales, the explicit call for Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship (Awdurdod Cymwysterau, Cwricwlwm ac Asesu Cymru 2002) has placed global citizenship education discourse very firmly in schools. The Scottish Executive's document, An International Outlook: Educating Young Scots about the World (Scottish Executive 2001), differs from the above in that it strongly emphasises the importance of the European (and

economic) dimension in the school curriculum, asserting that ‘we are already European citizens, with rights and responsibilities...we must earn a living within an increasingly global economy’ (2001: 7, my emphasis). Collectively these governmental recommendations and strategies for schools present a number of key drivers for postnational citizenship in the UK:

- Developing understandings of other cultures and a commitment to common human values (including social justice, human rights, and sustainable living);
- Enabling young people to ‘work in a global society and work in a global economy’ (Department for Education and Skills 2004: 3);
- Increasing young people’s knowledge of global issues and global interdependence;
- Increasing social and political participation resulting in an active citizenry;
- Promoting social cohesion;
- Raising standards (including ‘raising aspiration and achievement’, Scottish Executive 2001: 5).

Many of the attempts to put a postnational conception of citizenship on the agenda also stem from a perceived need to respond to global-scale problems such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and poverty and to engage with the challenges posed by the global effects of cultural, ethnic, and religious plurality (Olssen et al. 2004). These sorts of drivers, however, are less well articulated in the official education policies and documents mentioned above and are more likely to be addressed in calls for local citizenship education and participation (as reflected in CIC 2007 for example, discussed later), in calls for environmental education and education for sustainable development (Department for Education and Skills 2006), or in calls from the global media. Also worth recognising are the requests put forward by school students themselves, as evidenced in a the 2008 Ipsos Marketing and Opinion Research International survey of Young People’s Experiences of Global Learning (Ipsos Marketing and Opinion Research International/Development

Education Association 2008) which identifies a demand from students for global learning in schools. Carried out on behalf of the Development Education Association (a large NGO, discussed later) this survey of 1,995 school pupils from around England revealed that 78% of pupils think it is important that schools help them understand what people can do to ‘make the world a better place’ and help them critically engage with global news stories. Although interestingly, nearly twice as many students said that making money and earning a high salary is more important to them than making the world a better place.

Calls for Postnational Citizenship Education from within the Media

Citizenship is a key marker by which we can understand societal inclusion and the educational media provides a good indication of how postnational citizenship is being articulated. The Times Educational Supplement (TES) and the Guardian Education Supplement are key sources of news, journalism and information for teachers, parents, and educationalists in England and other parts of the UK. Over the past three years the Guardian Education Supplement has produced at least three ‘special supplements’ on the theme of global citizenship education, but none explicitly on European citizenship education-- supplements include The Global Classroom (14.11.06), Global Challenge (5.12.06), and Think Global (29.04.08). Similarly, the TES has produced at least two supplements entitled Go Global (25.11.04 and 12.11.05, these were supported by the British Council and the Department for Education and Skills). A recent search of the archives from the last ten years on the publications’ respective websites retrieved 167 articles related to global citizenship versus 110 on European citizenship in the Guardian Education section, and 264 versus only 22 respectively on the TES website (websites accessed June 2, 2008).

Beyond the educational media we must also consider how the wider media, specifically online and television sources, are defining our understanding of globalisation and the global arena. The extent to which media sources are encouraging us to engage with global

images and events in order to develop a sense of planetary responsibility is unprecedented. Urry (1998) takes forward the idea that global issues and especially 'images' are selected and emphasised in the media, blurring the boundaries between the public and private spheres, and the local and the global. The media is able to impose moral judgements on global issues and events through a process of shaming and a creation of global iconography. He states that 'contemporary citizenship is intertwined with representations of the globe which occur within the contemporary media' (1998: 9). He argues further that one 'precondition' of global citizenship is 'the development of global media, and especially images of threatened places which partly stand for the plight of the globe as a whole and which may enable people to view themselves as citizens of the globe, as opposed to, or at least as well as, citizens of a nation-state' (1998: 7). An interesting question would be to what extent people in the UK are engaging with media images of the European (and how are these selected) in relation to that of the global? The situatedness of the European and global imaginaries reaching schools is certainly worth remembering, and, with that understanding, Delanty (2000: 115) has argued that the UK's 'attempts to create a European ethnos through a media policy are not particularly impressive when compared to the still mighty national press and media and the American dominance of the global market in communications'.

Whilst engagement with the media features as one of the many areas of recommended content of the National Curriculum for citizenship (Qualification and Curriculum Authority 2007), Finnish commentators on global citizenship education have gone as far as to say that media literacy and cultural literacy must be the essential components of global education (Kaivola and Melén-Paaso 2007: 113). They say that the two are linked and that global media literacy entails 'access to the media, skills in analysing, evaluating, and creating media content' (Kaivola and Melén-Paaso 2007: 112). Their argument is appropriate to the UK context. The position could be strengthened by a more explicit reference to the research and

analysis that recognises the significance of media images in determining the selection of global and European knowledge, as well as that which recognises the prominent role of the media (in particular the television) in providing young people with their sources of citizenship-related knowledge and news (as revealed in the IEA Civic Education study, Torney-Purta et. al. 2001, and in the Ipsos MORI Global Learning study, Ipsos MORI/DEA 2008).

To summarise, calls for the development of global citizenship and European citizenship education in schools come from a wide range of different organisations (such as inter-governmental bodies, national governments, NGOs, the voluntary and business sector) some of who are able to work through or with the media. These calls cover a wide range of different agendas, including: sustainability, internationalisation, economic integration, and skills and knowledge for the global economy, and social justice and equality. Demands for postnational citizenship in schools are also connected with the view that the social is no longer solely local so that, in this respect, schools are always part of global networks and flows of information, goods and people (Urry 2000) and that the global media has a significant role to play in these exchanges.

All of these drivers must be carefully historically, politically, culturally, and geographically contextualised, and situated amongst wider instrumentalist agendas.

Situating the Postnational Citizenship Education Agendas and Identifying Tensions

The EU has utterly failed to bring about any degree of civic engagement as far as citizenship is concerned and has on the whole confined citizenship to rights (Delanty 2007: 66).

The economic and especially rights-based agendas in European citizenship education resources and recommendations in the UK are arguably more dominant than any other European agenda or European knowledge source. The pluralism of the EU is supposedly united by this rights-based uniform standard, which embodies the need to uphold the rule of law and democratic political processes. The concern, articulated by Delanty (2007) above,

that this has led to a more passive or thin citizenry engagement is currently being countered by an emphasis upon ‘active’ or participatory European citizenship education (Milana 2008). The argument presented here is that this ‘active’ agenda has yet to reach schools in England in a significant way (although it has featured in student exchange programmes and with increasing regularity in local governmental discourse particularly in relation to town twinning, what is known as ‘sister cities’ in the USA). Instead, schools are much more likely to be grappling with local and/or global questions. In the light of the Ajegbo report (2007), questions surrounding British citizenship or Britishness are particularly prominent in the media and public policy debates as reflected in the cover story of a recent TES supplement ‘Being British: Can you teach it?’ (Manning 2008). Also prominent are questions surrounding global citizenship education or the global dimension (highlighted in the report Whole-School Development and the Global Dimension/Global Citizenship, Critchley and Unwin 2007).

A report from the Commission on Integration and Cohesion in England entitled Our Shared Future (Commission on Integration and Cohesion 2007) also highlighted this political prioritisation of the local and national identities and placed its concerns firmly in the context of the global (containing very little reference to the European). The purpose of this report and associated research is to identify ways of improving local community integration and cohesion with a sense of ‘shared futures’ at the heart of the proposals--‘an emphasis on articulating what binds communities together rather than what differences divide them, and prioritising a shared future over divided legacies’--with an underpinning framework based upon rights, responsibilities, respect, civility, and ‘visible social justice’ (Commission on Integration and Cohesion 2007: 7). This discourse contrasts with the ‘united in diversity’ approach of recent European citizenship initiatives (Keating 2007). The report acknowledges that many of the issues that concern British citizens at a local level today relate to the global

economic, political, technological, and cultural context in which people find themselves, most notably to the social consequences of ‘global flows of money, people and information’ (2007: 3). The review itself is driven by a number of factors, namely:

The changes in people, their backgrounds and our experiences are what have come across as the strongest influences on our views about integration and cohesion. So this report reflects the need for communities to become increasingly comfortable with these social processes of thinking locally and acting globally (Commission on Integration and Cohesion 2007: 4).

Recognising the multiple faiths, cultures, races, and other forms of group status or identity in existence in the UK, this report mostly portrays children and childhoods as both local and global, and the only time European is mentioned is in relation to the ‘resulting flux at a local level’ caused by the ‘flow of EU citizens from Eastern Europe’ (Commission on Integration and Cohesion 2007: 14).

Articulations of active citizenship within a national framework are easily found; in fact, it is difficult to find a citizenship education resource, website, or policy that does not make reference to active or participatory citizenship (for example, the Institute for Citizenship uses the term active citizenship throughout its website, www.citizen.org.uk, accessed June 2, 2008). Thus emphasis upon participation and action implies a prioritisation of education ‘for’ citizenship over education ‘about’ citizenship and this has considerable pedagogical implications. Moreover, this situation raises significant epistemological questions about what constitutes a citizenship curriculum. Comparable tensions exist in relation to education for and/or about global and European citizenship.

The biggest tension, however, relates to two key global instrumentalist agendas within global and European citizenship education curricula: the technical-economic instrumentalism that requires a pragmatist (and arguably neo-liberal) understanding of legal structures, rights and responsibilities; and the global social justice instrumentalism that requires an emotional (and arguably active) commitment to, and understanding of, economic, political, legal, or

cultural injustice. Recognising that many more agendas are at play than these and that the two agendas themselves are highly complex and increasingly indistinguishable, the dualism is helpful for exploring conceptualisations of and relationships between postnational citizenship educations in the UK and elsewhere. We can ask of the media, which of these two agendas is the more dominant when they select global and/or European citizenship issues? By examining research featuring the dominance of knowledge-economy discourse and the economic-instrumentalist agendas in education around the world (contained in a number of forms in Lauder et al 2006), we would be wise to recognise the comparatively reduced powers of the social justice agendas.

A particularly good illustration of the dominance of the economic agenda in global citizenship education policy can be seen in the document Putting the World into World Class Education (Department for Education and Skills 2004). Despite the need to ‘instil a strong global dimension into the learning experience of all children and young people’ and to ‘support the improvement of education and children’s services worldwide, particularly in Africa’, the overarching goal advocated by this document is to equip young people and adults ‘for life in a global society and work in a global economy’ and to ensure that the EU become ‘the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world’ (Department for Education and Skills 2004: 3^{vi}, my emphasis). Learning in a global context therefore is understood by the British government as being about equipping ‘employers and their employees with the skills needed for a global economy’, involving the learning of economically-useful languages, and the move towards ‘mutual recognition and improved transparency of qualifications’ (Department for Education and Skills 2004: 6). The eight key concepts that then get listed in the document (diversity, interdependence, social justice, sustainable development, and so forth, originating from the NGO produced, DfES-endorsed document DfES 2005, discussed earlier), can therefore be seen in a very different light from

the way in which, for example, a development education NGO like Oxfam or Save the Children (with more overt social justice agendas) might view them.

In European citizenship education discourse, the tension might be exemplified by the efficiency-economic, and integrationist imperatives of the EU in contrast to the participatory, rights-based calls for active European citizenship. However, this relationship can also be seen from another angle: that both the rights-based and economic-based agendas are one and the same in that they are based upon an exclusionary underlying principle upheld by a legal, liberal-democratic political system. As to which way an educationalist or student sees it might largely depend upon her/his ideological and political stance, value system, and understanding and experience of human rights.

It is important to discover how schools and their curricula negotiate and interpret these tensions. We may find that some schools choose to allow students to select their own postnational knowledge (in which case a careful critique of the role of their parents and the media is required), providing them instead with a selection of skills that they hope will enable young people to best negotiate this knowledge. We may find that schools place an emphasis upon language learning, or international exchanges, or upon individual citizen and consumer rights in a national, European, and international context. We may find schools that encourage an overtly values-based active, participatory, and impassioned engagement with European issues, selecting for themselves which skills and knowledge are most appropriate. Or, we may discover that some schools select and recontextualise a range of global issues and knowledge that spans both social justice and economic instrumentalist agendas, whilst simultaneously pointing out to students that processes of social construction, selection, and recontextualisation are at work in the creation of the curriculum. This latter scenario might be most strongly advocated by someone like Geissel (2008) who draws upon research in Germany to reveal that it is more important that young people are attentive--and as attentive

citizens are ‘politically more knowledgeable, identify more strongly with the democratic system’ and ‘feel more politically competent’ (2008: 34)--than satisfied, dissatisfied or even active citizens.

Another opinion about how global or European citizenship can be best translated into schools in a UK context comes from Blaney (2002: 268) who suggests that young Western students can only really understand social injustice by being disempowered in some way and that this requires a very different pedagogical approach in order to challenge ‘their sense of interpretative privilege and cultural superiority’ to those who suggest active intentionally ‘empowering’ participatory educational methods. Instead, Blaney (2002: 268) suggests that global/European curricula needs to find ‘a balance between empowering our students while cultivating a sense of humility in the face of a complex world, a willingness to live with ambiguity, and an ethos of political self-restraint when in an advantaged position’.

Models for Relating Global and European Citizenship in Education

Having recognised that there are calls for both European and global dimensions (amongst others) in education in the UK and that each has accompanying understandings of a European and global citizenry, and having situated these in a particular Western context and recognising the instrumentalist agendas at play, consideration to how they work in relation to one another can now be given. There are clearly a number of similarities between these two postnational citizenship education agendas--they both emphasise the need to provide young people with the skills, tools, knowledge, and understanding to deal with difference, and are both concerned with the development of an identity (or set of identities) in spaces and places beyond the local and the national. They are both explicitly concerned with promoting social cohesion. We are able to apply similar theoretical frameworks in the critique of these citizenry ideals (such as the socially and historically constructed nature of ‘the global’ and ‘the European’) and we are able to recognise the role of the ‘imaginary’ in both (discussed

later). Nevertheless the spatial or geographical remit of the two educational concepts are significantly different and this paper has argued that, in the UK, at a practical level European citizenship education remains in the shadow of global citizenship education. There are a growing number of ‘global dimension in education’ policies, reports and sources that showcase global education activity (summarised, for example, in Critchley and Unwin 2008, and in Development Education Association 2008), although it is worth highlighting that some schools do not engage with either global or European citizenship in their curricula at all; there are considerable obstacles to global citizenship education in schools (Davies et. al. 2005); and whilst there is increased interest in postnational citizenship education there is little evidence of any impact beyond the anecdotal.

Further consideration of how the two educational forms or traditions can relate to one another is worthwhile. Two particular models for the interrelationship between global and European citizenship education policy and curriculum can be identified. The first might be called the dual model. By drawing upon the work of Kant, Hegstrup (2006) considers the idea of dual citizenship in education when considering the relationship between community citizenship and global (or what he calls ‘world’) citizenship. This model could also be applied to the relationship between European and global. One could understand the community level to encompass the local, national, and the European, where this self, societal and politically constructed space is bounded by identifiable norms, traditions, laws, residence, and legally-enshrined rights. The global level embodies the aspirational and is future-oriented; it is not defined in terms of a specific polity but instead in terms of international human rights and a complex mixture of the economic and social justice agenda. The notion of ‘dual’ suggests that these identities exist simultaneously--it could also be called a ‘slice model’ as a slice of a young person’s sense of citizenship would entail a complex mixture of identities and citizenships.

The problems associated with this first model is that the national and local are equated with the European, and any evidence for the lack of engagement with the European in the UK (whether because of linguistic or financial obstacles, or political disillusionment) such as the very low level of participation in European elections^{vii}, would present a considerable empirical challenge to anyone attempting to illustrate the relevance of the model in the UK. However, it may be appropriate to other EU countries; for example, articulation of the global in relation to the European in Kaivola and Melén-Paaso (2007) suggest that this model might translate in Finland.

The second model could be called the tiered model as it refers to a sequencing of the local/community/regional, to the national/federal to the international such as the European or Commonwealth, to the Global. It suggests that identities are assumed to be bounded, sequenced, or separate in some way and is actually more evident in educational text and policy than might be expected--particularly in England (Department for Education and Skills 2004) and Scotland (Scottish Executive 2001). The problems associated with this model relate to the fact that it is not necessarily useful in the quest to articulate hybrid identities. In contrast to the dual model, it does not help us to differentiate between the polity/rights/residential based citizenships and the non-politically bounded, more overtly values-based citizenships. Nevertheless, this second model does help us see how young people are learning to negotiate different levels of citizenship, exposing the complexities associated with multiple loyalties and levels of responsibility.

Of course there will be different ways of theorising the relationships between postnational citizenship educations in different parts of the world and it is essential to recognise that these models are situated in a Western and European context. It is quite possible that they might be better understood with the assistance of a postcolonial critique of

the European ideal of cosmopolitanism, which helps us further reflect upon how we are engaging with ‘the other’ in this conceptualisation of citizenship education.

Defining, Excluding and Multiplying

Citizenship is an excellent concept for understanding societal inclusion and exclusion. In asking young people to define, understand, and engage with what European citizenship is, we are simultaneously asking them to define what it is not. Citizenship is also a social construct, and therefore the terminology of the ‘imaginary’ is particularly appropriate and useful for discussing citizenry aspirations in education. The imagined European and global citizenships entering school curricula from NGOs, media and governmental sources are worth unpacking.

The term European ‘dimension’ in education (and the curriculum specifically) is possibly likely to be more familiar to schools in the UK, and other parts of the EU than European citizenship education (even though the latter may be more apparent in EU and Council of Europe policy documents). The European dimension is often associated with cross-curricularity, the learning of languages, and intercultural education. It is also interlinked with the idea of a European citizenship and European identity, but it is less committal and political, and therefore arguably more accessible to teachers. Philippou (2005: 349) argues that, in contrast to the terminology of the European dimension (which she maintains can be interpreted in a range of ways):

European citizenship (as defined in Maastricht and Amsterdam) only includes economically active citizens and nationals of member-states and excludes migrants (for example, Turks and Muslims), third country nationals, asylum-seekers, non-Europeans or ethnic minority communities.

Nevertheless, the language of citizenship(s) is increasingly prominent in educational discourse and the need for education for and/or about European citizenship can be found in a number of citizenship education related websites and resources--for example, the Speak Out project at the Institute for Citizenship, www.citizen.org.uk [accessed June 2008], where

young people are encouraged to learn and debate about European expansion, the European constitution, the European Convention on Human Rights, and the complexities of democracy. However, a definition of European citizenship education is neither given or nor invited anywhere within this website.

Delanty (2007: 69) has usefully distinguished between a rights-based and efficiency-based vision of Europe, which can in turn point us to different conceptualisations of the European citizen. The efficiency or economic-based vision refers to the original European constitutional project for economic integration and free movement of goods and labour. The economic instrumentalist agenda for European citizenship education leads us neatly to a particular political-economic knowledge base--aiming at the homo economicus ('able to enhance the Economy', Kazamias 2001 cited in Philippou 2005: 347). The more recent rights-based conception of the European polity invites a slightly different understanding of European citizenship education and its purpose, with rights, albeit 'selected' rights, at the heart of the knowledge-base with the ability to exercise these in social settings--aiming at the homo koinonicus ('socially and intellectually able', Kazamias 2001 cited in Philippou 2005: 347). However, both understandings are vulnerable to critique for being exclusionary.

Delanty (2000: 115) suggests that there is 'a growing sense of the need to express an identity of exclusion, a supranationality, when the reference point is the non-European' and that Europeans are 'inventing an ethnos of exclusion'. Indeed, whilst many European social policies might have been targeted at fighting social exclusion and increasing socio-economic integration, an integrative idea of European citizenship is problematic in a society where 'up to a seventh of the population consists of foreign-born or foreign-descended residents' (Wagner 2007: 94) and where there are those who are excluded from access to certain European resources and rights. Wagner (2007: 96) has suggested that European citizenship needs to be more inclusive of the notion of 'residential citizenship', which goes beyond

political rights, and ‘identity-based forms of political participation through cultural and ethnic communities of political participation’. These residential groups and communities of interest may also want to ponder the existence and/or development of a collective, ‘European’ identity or ‘Leikultur’ (guiding culture), or what Habermas (summarised in Delanty 2000: 115) has argued, the creation of ‘a common political-cultural identity which would stand out against the cultural orientations of the different nationalities’. However, in the context of the recent expansion of the European Union to include Eastern European countries for example, young people (and adults) might legitimately ask what difference there is between imagining themselves as citizens situated in a culturally and linguistically diverse Europe versus a culturally and linguistically diverse world.

There is a strong argument that European identity is essentially a legal or rights-based identity as opposed to the complexity of a cultural identity. Europe is not a society or set of societies based upon cultural consensus (Delanty 2000: 118) or with commitments to cultural traditions, and in some situations neither is the nation state. Instead we are familiar with a European set of liberal, constitutional, and rights-based norms and a European ‘political’ community. This republican tradition of citizenship with its understanding of ‘particular’ rights and duties in a particular polity (Delanty 2007) contrasts with a cosmopolitan understanding of citizenship associated with the work of Kant, and it is linked with human rights and universal citizenship or the ‘universal commitment to respect the rights of all citizens regardless of their nationality’ (Delanty 2007: 64)--although Delanty characterises the European history as formed through a tension of republican and cosmopolitan trends, this has not necessarily translated into educational settings. Ultimately however, the EU was originally founded upon economic imperatives--the free movement of goods, capital, and labour--as opposed to a social justice framework aimed at improving the lives of its citizens. European citizenship is underpinned by an emphasis upon rights, being able to bring about

change on a national level. However, it is possible to argue that, in a global context, these rights are ‘selected’ and prioritised carefully in order to ensure ideological coherence--which inevitably means that some people’s rights are prioritised over others and that there are certain trade-offs at play.

A postnational identity is potentially compatible with multiple identities, and this paper is not arguing that the European identity is incompatible, but more that young people may view other citizenship spaces as more relevant to their everyday lives. ‘Europe’ has to be seen as something that historically has been (and that continues to be) politically and socially constructed. Of course this is also the case, perhaps to an even greater extent, when we consider the imagining or construction of ‘the global’. In the field of environmental science and environmental education, there is some familiarity with the socially (and media) constructed nature of issues such as climate change and the environment (recognised in Robottom and Hart 1993). Tools and theories to aid critique of the socially and historically constructed nature of ‘the global’, global citizenship, and the phenomena associated with globalisation can also be found in postcolonial theory--for example Andreotti (2006, 2007) has developed an effective theoretical framework for engaging with indigenous perspectives of global and development agendas in global citizenship education. Andreotti usefully draws upon the work of Andrew Dobson and Gayatri Spivak to critique the dominant global constructs in global citizenship education literature and discourse in the UK which Spivak, for example might see as reinforcing ‘eurocentrism and triumphalism as people are encouraged to think that they live in the centre of the world, that they have a responsibility to ‘help the rest’ and that ‘people from other parts of the world are not fully global’” (Andreotti 2006: 5).

Like its European counterpart, the term global ‘dimension’ is more frequently found in educational literature and policy in the UK than global citizenship education. In the joint

government and NGO recommendation for schools, Developing the Global Dimension in the School Curriculum (Department for Education and Skills 2005), the global dimension is defined in terms of eight key concepts: global citizenship; social justice; conflict resolution; sustainable development; values and perceptions; human rights; interdependence; and diversity. Global citizenship is therefore defined as one of the themes that a curriculum incorporating a global dimension should address. To accompany this document the Development Education Association (an important umbrella NGO with a membership of the majority of global education related organisations throughout the UK), has produced a number of subject specific global dimension booklets (e.g. The Global Dimension of Science, Development Education Association 2003). However, Andreotti has critiqued the literature and discourse of the global dimension in the UK for articulating the notion that ‘different cultures only have ‘traditions beliefs and values’’ while ‘the West’ has,

(Universal) knowledge (and even constructs knowledge about these cultures). The idea of a ‘common history’, which only acknowledges the contribution of other cultures to science and mathematics... projects the values, beliefs and traditions of the West as global and universal, while foreclosing the historical processes that led to this universalisation. (2006: 5)

Although the vaguer terminology of a ‘dimension’ might appear more often in official and unofficial global education related literature and policy in the UK, the idea of global citizenship education, as defined by Oxfam for example (2006), is increasingly familiar to schools and the organisations and individuals (such as specifically appointed international education officers in local government authorities) that work with them. Andreotti (2006) alludes above to the lack of theorisation of global citizenship education in the UK, and this is indeed a problem, but a body of work is emerging. In particular, there are those who theorise and engage with global citizenship education in relation to the philosophy of cosmopolitanism (Banks 2008, Gunesch 2004, Heater 2002, Osler and Starkey 2003, Roth 2007) extending models of Kantian cosmopolitan democracy offered by those such as David

Held, and cosmopolitanism (a concept explored in detail in a 2006 special edition of the British Journal of Sociology, Volume 57, Number 1, including authors such as Ulrich Beck, Gerard Delanty, Bryan Turner and Andrew Dobson). Roth (2007: 18) articulates the significance of this cosmopolitan discourse in the following way:

Individuals with multiple identities do not necessarily show loyalty only towards the nation, where the majority values, knowledge and norms have been mixed together with a political culture. Such people also frequently feel they are loyal towards different types of commonality... trans-national commonalities.

Those advocating and describing cosmopolitan citizenship education arguing ‘citizenship education should also help students to develop an identity and attachment to the global community and a human connection to people around the world’, also draw upon the work of Martha Nussbaum and Kwame Anthony Appiah who highlight the intertwined relationship between global and local identities, as the following example illustrates:

Global identities, attachments and commitments constitute cosmopolitanism.... Cosmopolitans identify with peoples from diverse cultures throughout the world. Nussbaum contrasts cosmopolitan universalism and internationalism with parochial ethnocentrism and inward-looking patriotism... both Nussbaum and Appiah view local identities as important for cosmopolitans (Banks 2008: 134).

Although it is important to recognise that in some parts of the world there is a powerful pull towards national identities as people search for a sense of inclusion, and that the process of labelling this as ‘inward-looking’ or parochially ethnocentric can sometimes smack of Western elitism.

Another useful way of critically engaging with global citizenship education might be found through a recognition of the existence of multiple global citizenships. Having discussed the globalisation of scapes, Urry (1998) considers a number of global citizenships or types of global citizen today that can be found in a plurality of global spaces and places. From global capitalists ‘who seek to unify the world around global corporate interests which are increasingly denationalised’, global reformers, global environmental managers, earth citizens ‘who seek to take responsibility for the globe through a distinct and often highly

localised ethics of care', to global networkers 'who set up and sustain work or leisure networks constituted across national boundaries' (Urry 1998: 4). Amongst others, he also identifies the group 'global cosmopolitans' who develop 'an ideology of openness towards other cultures, peoples and environments' and who are concerned about developing an 'orientation' to other 'citizens, societies and cultures across the globe' (1998: 4). Schools have to develop pedagogical and curricular responses to this plurality of postnational citizenships, global agendas, and ways in which individuals can choose to respond/relate to the global. Whatever particular type of global citizen we are or become (and that may be a combination of types), we have to negotiate the complex 'prism' of global and local risks, rights and duties. Different advocates of global citizenship education (e.g. NGO workers or governmental officials) prioritise certain global citizen 'types' over others according to their particular agenda.

Towards a Research Agenda

The aim of this paper was not to attack EU policy and the idea of European citizenship education, but to critically engage with the global context in which it is taking place and the relationship it has with its postnational counterpart, global citizenship education, in a particular and possibly unique regional context--the UK. Over the past decades there has been a rise in calls for UK schools to develop a more European and global orientation in their pedagogy and curriculum and to equip children and young people with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that will make them more globally minded. These calls are informed by a recognition that the world is becoming increasingly interdependent as a result of transformations in the economy, the development of information and communication technologies and mass migration. Calls for postnational citizenship education also derive from a perceived need to respond to global-scale problems such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and poverty and to engage with the challenges posed by the global effects

of cultural, ethnic, and religious plurality. These problems are often selected and rearticulated by the media (and correspondingly the educational media further selects and recontextualises these issues in its projection of a postnational citizenship education curricula)--especially online and on television, a source of great influence to the (postnational) citizenry knowledge of young people.

In this paper the exclusionary nature of citizenship has been recognised, and the universalist pretences of a global citizenship have been explored in the light of postcolonial critiques and the existence of multiple global citizenships. Given the exclusionary nature of citizenship (Delanty 2000, 2007), Urry (1998: 9) asks whether there can actually be global citizenship where no-one is excluded or 'whether a sense of global citizenship is a historically unique notion which is not in fact based on the contestation between global citizens and others'. In other words, although we recognise that global citizens will be 'well aware of differences' his concluding array of questions include,

...has a conception of citizenship developed which does not presume an enemy, an other? Or alternatively does the lack of an 'enemy' for the global citizen mean that such a citizenship will never develop on any significant scale – there are no global citizens because there is nobody to be excluded? (Urry 1998: 9).

If we recognise a plurality of global citizenships it may well be that some global citizenships clash with others (if they have opposing agendas), thus creating a perceived 'excluded' group of people.

Throughout this paper questions and hypotheses have been raised and informed predictions given, but the astute reader will recognise the lack of empirical evidence supporting many of these. This paper draws to a close by pointing to the need for research beyond the rhetoric, beyond the assumptions, with the intention of testing these hypotheses about the curricula of, obstacles to and interrelations between global citizenship education and European citizenship education in the UK and beyond. This research must recognise the situatedness and imaginary or socially-constructed nature of different forms of global and

European citizenship education, and place these in the context of powerful economic instrumentalist agendas. This research should also engage with young people and could do worse than begin by asking what sort of citizens they imagine themselves to be in this culturally and linguistically diverse world, and how they distinguish between ‘the European’ and ‘the global’ in this process.

To facilitate this research it could be that we need new, or at least different, ways of theorising the curriculum and pedagogy. A theory of the curriculum is needed which incorporates a deeper understanding of citizenship, and in turn, citizenship education; includes an awareness of the exclusive and non-exclusive nature of different citizenships; acknowledges the complexities associated with rights and responsibilities discourse in the context of global power inequalities; and recognises the existence of particular instrumentalist (and possibly non-instrumentalist) agendas. In addition to this, a theory of pedagogy is required which also recognises these dimensions of citizenship and which better acknowledges the place of emotion, identity, and imagination, and the ‘non-rational’ in educational relationships.

Works Cited

- Andreotti, V. (2006) Soft versus critical global citizenship education. Development Education Policy and Practice, 3, Autumn, 83--98 (Belfast: Centre for Global Education).
- Andreotti, V. (2007) An ethical engagement with the other: Spivak's ideas on education. Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 1 (1), 69--79.
- Awdurdod Cymwysterau, Cwricwlwm ac Asesu Cymru. (2002) Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship, (Cardiff: Qualifications, Curriculum and Assessment Authority for Wales [ACCAC]). Available online at: <http://old.accac.org.uk/uploads/documents/212.pdf>, accessed 15 May 2008.
- Banks, J. (2008) Diversity, global identity, and citizenship education in a global age. Educational Researcher, 38 (3), 129--139.
- Blaney, D. (2002) Global education, disempowerment and a curricula for a world politics. Journal of Studies in International Education, 6 (3), 268-282.
- Commission on Integration and Cohesion. (2007) Our Shared Future (Wetherby: Commission on Integration and Cohesion, CIC).
- Critchley, M. and Unwin, R. (2008) Whole-School Development and the Global Dimension/Global Citizenship: Capturing Models of Practice across the UK (Development Education Centre South Yorkshire). Available online at: www.decsy.org.uk, accessed 2 June 2008.
- Davies, L., Harber, C. and Yamashita, H. (2005) Global Citizenship: The Needs of Teachers and Learners – Key Findings from the DFID Project (Birmingham: Centre for International Education and Research, Birmingham University).
- Delanty, G. (2000) Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture and Politics (Buckingham: Open University Press).

- Delanty, G. (2007) European citizenship: a critical assessment. Citizenship Studies, 11 (1), 63--72, February 2007.
- Department for Education and Skills. (2004) Putting the World into World Class Education: An International Strategy for Education, Skills and Children's Services (London: Department for Education and Skills).
- Department for Education and Skills. (2005) Developing the Global Dimension in the School Curriculum, second edition (London: Department for Education and Skills).
- Department for Education and Skills. (2006) Schools for the Future: Design of Sustainable Schools – Case Studies (Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills Publications).
- Department for Education and Skills. (2007) Curriculum Review: Diversity and Citizenship (Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills Publications).
- Development Education Association. (2003) Science: the Global Dimension (London: Development Education Association).
- Development Education Association. (2008) Global Matters: Case Studies of Education for a Just and Sustainable World (London: Development Education Association).
- Geissel, B. (2008) Reflections and findings on the critical citizen: Civic education – What for? European Journal of Political Research, 47 (1), 34—63.
- Gunesch, K. (2004) Education for cosmopolitanism. Journal of Research in International Education, 3 (3), 251--275.
- Heater, D. (2002) World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and its Opponents (London: Continuum).
- Hegstrup, S. (2006) World Citizenship as an Educational Project: From Weltschmerz to Rap. Paper presented at the Eigth Conference of Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe Thematic Network, Riga 2006. Available online at:

http://cice.londonmet.ac.uk/members/pdfs/2006_019.pdf, accessed 20

November 2008.

Hicks, D. (2003) Thirty years of global education: a reminder of key principles and precedents. Educational Review, 55 (3), 265-275.

Ipsos Market and Opinion Research International/Development Education Association

(2008) Our Global Future: How can education meet the challenge of

change? Young People's Experiences of Global Learning: An Ipsos Market and

Opinion Research International Research Study on behalf of Development

Education Association. Available online at: www.dea.org.uk, accessed 15 June 2008.

Kaivola, T. and Melén-Paaso, M. (eds) (2007) Education for Global Responsibility – Finnish Perspectives, Publications of the Ministry of Education 2007:31 (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press for the Ministry of Education)

Keating, A. (2007) The Europeanisation of Citizenship Education Politics and Policy-Making in Europe and Ireland. PhD thesis, the University of Cambridge, UK.

Lauder, H., Brown, P., Dillabough, J., Halsey, A. (2006) Education, Globalisation and Social Change (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Lisbon European Council (2000) Declaration of the European Council's Lisbon Goal.

Available online at:

http://consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/00100-r1.en0.htm, accessed 15 July 2008.

Manning, S. (2008) The Brit pack. Times Education Supplement, 25 April 2008.

Marshall, H. (2005) The Sociology of Global Education: Power, Pedagogy and Practice. PhD thesis, the University of Cambridge, UK.

Marshall, H. (2007a) The global education terminology debate: exploring some of the issues in the UK. In M. Hayden, J. Levy and J. Thompson (eds) A Handbook of Research in

- International Education (London: Sage), 38--50.
- Marshall, H. (2007b) Global education in perspective: fostering a global dimension in an English secondary school. Cambridge Journal of Education, 37 (3), 355--374.
- Milana, M. (2008) Is the European (active) citizenship ideal fostering inclusion within the union? A critical review. European Journal of Education, 43 (2), 207--216.
- Olssen, M., Codd, J., and O'Neil, A. (2004) Education Policy: Globalization, Citizenship and Democracy (London: Sage Publications Limited).
- Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2003) Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: theoretical debates and young people's experiences. Educational Review, 55 (3), 243--254.
- Oxfam. (1997) A Curriculum for Global Citizenship (Oxford: Oxfam Development Education).
- Oxfam. (2006) Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools (Oxford: Oxfam Development Education).
- Philippou, S. (2005) The 'problem' of the European dimension: a principled reconstruction of the Greek Cypriot curriculum. European Educational Research Journal 4 (4), 343-367.
- Qualification and Curriculum Authority. (2007) Citizenship: Programme of study for key stages 3 and 4 (London: Qualification and Curriculum Authority). Available online at: <http://curriculum.qca.org.uk>, accessed 15 May 2008.
- Robottom, I. and Hart. P. (1993) Research in Environmental Education: Engaging the Debate (Geelong: Deakin University Press).
- Roth, K. (2007) Cosmopolitan learning. In: K. Roth & N. Burbules (eds), Changing Notions of Citizenship Education in Contemporary Nation-States (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers).

- Scottish Executive. (2001) An International Outlook: Educating Young Scots about the World (Edinburgh: Scottish Executive). Available online at:
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2001/09/10037/File-1>, accessed 2 June 2008.
- Smith, S. (2007) Deliberating publics of citizens: post-national citizenship amidst global public spheres. In: K. Roth & N. Burbules (eds), Changing Notions of Citizenship Education in Contemporary Nation-States (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers).
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001) Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen (Delft: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement [IEA]).
- Urry, J. (1998) Globalisation and Citizenship, paper published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YN, UK. Available online at:
<http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Urry-Globalisation-and-Citizenship.pdf>, accessed 20 November 2007.
- Urry, J. (2000) Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Next Century (London: Routledge).
- Wagner, A. (2007) Citizenship through education: A comment on ‘Social exclusion in Europe: some conceptual issues’. International Journal of Social Welfare, 17 (1), 93—97.

* Dr Harriet Marshall is a lecturer in the Department of Education at the University of Bath, Bath, BA2 7AY, UK; e-mail: h.marshall@bath.ac.uk. Her interests relate to global citizenship education and her papers can be found in the Cambridge Journal of Education, the International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education and the journal World Studies in Education, as well as in edited books cited in this paper.

ⁱ The National Curriculum for Citizenship in England is statutory for Key Stages 3 and 4 (11-16 year olds) and recommended for Key Stages 1 and 2 (Primary schools), QCA 2007.

ⁱⁱ Although related governmental documents and endorsements have been more visible since 2001 as will be discussed later in this paper.

ⁱⁱⁱ A recent governmental curriculum review on diversity and citizenship, known as the Ajegbo report (the review to which it refers was led by Sir Keith Ajegbo, DFES 2007) emphasised how young peoples' identities in the UK are typically constructed as multiple and plural.

^{iv} For further discussion of the global education terminology debate see Marshall 2007a.

^v See the website of Ming-Dao High School in Taiwan, <http://cai.mingdao.edu.tw> (accessed 15/07/08).

^{vi} Interesting to note the link between this phase and that of the Lisbon European Council's ten year target set for the EU in March 2000, wanting Europe to become 'the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustained economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion' (Lisbon European Council 2000).

^{vii} UK turnout in the European elections in 1999 was 24%, and 38.5% in 2004 (source www.electoralcommission.org.uk, accessed June 2, 2008).